

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,363	09/23/2003	Claudio Giorda	Q77674	9199
23373	7590 10/19/2005		EXAM	INER
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			ADDISU, SARA	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			3722	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<u> </u>			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/667,363	GIORDA, CLAUDIO			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Sara Addisu	3722			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR FOHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILII mensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUN CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a tion. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC y statute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. a reply be timely filed DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	23 September 2003.				
• =	•					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the applicated 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	ithdrawn from consideration.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exa	aminer.				
10)🛛	The drawing(s) filed on 18 March 2004 is	/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ ol	ojected to by the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection	- · ·	• •			
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the of the oath or declaration is objected to by the oath or declaration is objected to by the oath or declaration is objected to be the oath of the oath or declaration is objected to be the oath of th	•	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Esee the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in e priority documents have bee Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage			
Attachmer		_				
2) Notice 3) Infor	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9- mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/ er No(s)/Mail Date 3/18/04.	48) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) b(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

 Claims 1, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Straub et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,899), in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Straub et al. teaches a horizontal boring machine for boring cylindrical surfaces having horizontal axis and axially spaced apart from each other, such as the seats for an engine crankshaft in the crankcase of an internal combustion engine ('899, figure 3). AAPA also confirms that Figure 1 of Straub et al.'s invention is a reproduction of Figure 2 of the Instant Application (Specification, page 1, lines 28-29, therefore Straub et al. teaches the structures claimed in claim 1 (i.e. the boring machine including a boring bar driven in rotation by a chuck and carrying at least one cutting bit, driving means for driving rotation of said chuck, means for axially moving the group composed of the chuck and the associated driving means, a counter-bar coupled in rotation head-to-head with said boring bar and driven in rotation by a respective auxiliary chuck, driving means for driving the rotation of the auxiliary chuck in synchronism with the rotation of the

Art Unit: 3722

boring bar, means for axially moving the group composed of said counter-bar and the associated driving means, in synchronism with the axial movement of the boring bar, said boring bar being provided with a device for adjusting the radial position of said at least one cutting bit that is associated therewith) (AAPA, Page 1, line 28-page 3, line 19). Furthermore, Straub et al. teaches counter-bar (46) being provided with radially adjustable cutting bits at which point the coupling would be disposed approximately in the center similar to figure 1 and the counter-bar constitutes auxiliary boring bar ('899, Col. 10, lines 21-38 and Col. 3, lines 20-24).

2. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Straub et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,899), in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) and further in view of Horn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,880).

Straub et al. teaches all the elements as set forth in the above rejection.

Regarding claim 4, Straub et al. teaches in figures 3-6, a second embodiment where the boring bar (28) is equipped with axially staggered cutting tools (30a-30e) accommodated in bending tool fixtures (elastically deformable blade) (68) for radial adjustment due to a radial pin (66) {note: regarding claim 4, although AAPA states that ".. an arrangement with multiple cutting bits axially spaced apart from each other on the boring bar is unthinkable, as in this case it would be impossible in practice to make an automatic radial adjustment system for all of the cutting bits carried by the boring bar"

Art Unit: 3722

(AAPA, Page 3, lines 20-28), as mentioned above Straub et al. teaches in figures 3-6, a second embodiment where the boring bar (28) is equipped with axially staggered cutting tools (30a-30e)}.

However, Straub et al. fails to teach the main boring bar and the counter-bar being provided with a pair of diametrically opposed cutting bits. Straub et al. also fails to teach the elastically deformable blade being moved outwardly due to the radial pin engaging against a conical portion of a shaft.

Horn et al. teaches a device for finish machining of bearing bores at crankcases having spindle boxes (1 & 2), a tool bit (11) carried by a resilient tool holder (8) and a diametrically opposed semi-finish tool (15). Horn et al. also teaches a cutting bit (11) being carried near the free end of a resilient tool holder (8) while the opposite end is fixed to the body of the boring bar via screws (9) ('880, figure 1). The resilient tool holder (elastically deformable blade) (8) is moved outwardly due to the radial pin engaging against a conical portion (7) of a shaft sliding inside n axial cavity of a bar.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Straub et al.'s invention such that it includes a diametrically opposed tool, as taught by Horn et al. for the purpose of performing a semi-finish machining ('880, Col. 2, lines 50-51). The modified device of Straub et al. would therefore have a semi-finish tools diametrically opposed to each tool bit (30a-30e), therefore the semi-finish tools would also be axially staggered as are tool bits (30a-30e, '899, figure 4). It would have also been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Straub et al.'s invention such that

Art Unit: 3722

the radial movement of the elastically deformable tool holder is due to the radial pin engaging a conical portion of a shaft, as taught by Horn et al. for the purpose of ensuring that the tool holder and/or the tool will constantly take the desired position. ('880, Col. 1, lines 43-49).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sara Addisu at (571) 272-6082. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on (571) 272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sara Addisu (571)272-6082

BOYER D. ASHLEY PRIMARY EXAMINER

74 10/13/05